



# City of Tempe

MINUTES FOR THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
(PZ) MEETING

June 26, 2001  
Development Services Conf. Rm

## MEETING ATTENDEES:

Dave Mattson  
Manjula Vas  
Tom Oteri  
Kirby Spittler

Charles Huelmantell  
Joe Duke  
Ron Collett  
Mike DiDimenico

## STAFF ATTENDEES:

John DiTullio  
Dee Dee Kimbrell  
Bonnie Richardson  
Fred Brittingham  
Roger Millar, Otak

Steve Venker  
Hector Tapia  
Grace Kelly  
Scot Siegel, Otak

### • INTRODUCTION BY FRED BRITTINGHAM

### • OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY, ISSUES, NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY AND TOOLBOX

#### 1. KEY ISSUES

- MIXED USE districts – Discussion of criterion vs. use permit process
- SIGN ORDINANCE
- Trying to provide standards that are not as stringent and reduce the need for variances.
- PADs (Planned Area Developments) They would not be eliminated. You'd still have PADs, but a new procedure would be available as an option, so developers would not have to jump through all of the hoops if they follow the guidelines.
- PUBLIC NOTICE: What happens to the neighbor who wants to be notified? Is there an appeal process? Yes. Public notice of hearing still exists.
- Are you going to keep the current Hearing Officer process in place?
- Yes. Keeping it and expanding on it. Before you get to the application process, the developers has a formal pre-application process that is requires. Discuss key issues, put timeline in place and require documentation of a meeting with the neighborhood.
- Concerns that it seems difficult to enforce.
- Concerns that adding a requirement to meet with neighborhood could be cumbersome or add 6 months to the process. It's the small cases that neighbors complains about, not the large cases with experienced developers.
- Concerns over adding a beaucratic layer to the process.
- 300' is insufficient for neighborhood notification.

- CHANGING PROCESS BY COMBINING BOARDS- Land use and aesthetics is difficult to separate. There is a connection between BOA, PZ, DR and CC. Developers say they go to staff, and are given requirements. Then, they go to P& Z and are told something different. THEN, they go to DR and everyone wants something different.
- Do you want a process that combines land use, design and variances? We want you to empower staff.
- Why is Design Review a decision- making body and PZ a recommending body? Why is land use a recommendation and a color of paint a decision?
- Some suggestions of the toolbox are to give the Planning Commission decision making power with appeals to council
- OTHER ISSUES OF CONCERN:
  - Notification with appeal process
  - Use permit for second story home is a concern
  - Public review process is not a bad idea. Getting rid of it is a concern.
  - Too much stuff is going through process instead of hearing officer.
  - Hearing officer needs to be able to make a decision that sticks. Consent agenda items could be decided by Hearing Officer instead of by a board.
  - Use permit is a good tool – not just a standard
  - What is the process about consolidating boards and commissions? Have to find out what council's position is.
  - CPTED needs to be under Planning Commission purview.
  - Look at lighting standards by CPTED.
  - Expandable vs. retractable buildings.